

REMARKS

Claims 1-95 were filed in the original application. Applicants note that there were two “Claims 85” as filed and that the Examiner has renumbered Claims 85 to 95 (starting at the second Claim 85) to 86-96. The Examiner’s correction is reflected in, but not shown as amendment in, the listing of claims included herewith.

For business reasons and without acquiescing to the Examiner’s arguments as described below, and reserving the right to prosecute the same or similar claims in one or more future applications, Claims 1-17, 24, 34-48, 50-56, 59-63, 65-68, 70-73, and 75-96 are cancelled by the present amendment.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner has made the following rejections:

- I. Claims 35-42, 51, 61, 66, 71, and 86-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements;
- II. Claims 1-34, 43-45, 48-50, 52-60, 62, 68-70, 72-74, 75-85, and 89-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,598,049 to Zelinka (“Zelinka”);
- III. Claims 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Zelinka.

These rejections will be addressed in the order listed above.

- I. Claims 35-42, 51, 61, 66, 71, and 86-88 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. All of these claims are cancelled without prejudice by the present amendment, rendering this rejection moot.

II. Claims 1-34, 43-45, 48-50, 52-60, 62, 68-70, 72-74, 75-85, and 89-96 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,598,049 to Zelinka (“Zelinka”). Applicants respectfully disagree. The disclosure of Zelinka is substantially directed toward a synthesizer having a single reaction chamber (see, e.g., reaction cell 14 in Fig. 2). Although Zelinka asserts that a number of such cells *could* be coupled to the disclosed apparatus (column 7 at lines 6-9), Zelinka provides no description of how one would adapt the apparatus for the controlled delivery of reagents to more than one reaction cell using the disclosed system of syringes and valves. In particular, Zelinka discloses no means of controlling delivery of reagents in a fashion that would allow the parallel (simultaneous, side-by-side) synthesis of *different* polymers in multiple reaction cells attached to the disclosed device.

In contrast, the synthesizer of the present invention is configured to allow parallel synthesis (simultaneous, side-by-side synthesis) of multiple polymers (see, e.g., the specification at page 2, lines 13-15), e.g., polymers that are different in sequence and or length (see, e.g., page 2, lines 20-25). The synthesizers of the present invention comprise a plurality of reaction chambers, and further comprise a plurality of reagent dispensers configured to simultaneously form closed fluidic connections with each of the reaction chambers, wherein the reagent dispensers are each configured to deliver all reagents necessary for a polymer synthesis reaction (see, e.g., Claim 18). Zelinka does not disclose a synthesizer configured for parallel synthesis of distinct polymers in which a plurality of reagent dispensers are each configured to simultaneously form closed fluidic connections with each of a plurality of reaction chambers. Nonetheless, for business reasons and without acquiescing to the Examiner’s arguments, Claim 18 is herein amended to indicate that the plurality of reagent dispensers each comprise connections to a plurality of reagent delivery lines for the delivery of reagents necessary for a polymer synthesis reaction. Support for this amendment is found, e.g., at page 14, lines 22-25, and page 14, line 26-page 15, line 13). The remaining pending claims pending following entry of the present amendment, 19-23, 25-33, 49, 57-58, 64, 69, and 74, all depend from Claim 18 and thus comprise all of the limitations thereof. Zelinka does not disclose a synthesizer having a plurality of reagent dispensers wherein each reagent dispenser comprises connections to a plurality of reagent delivery lines.

For the reasons recited above, Applicants submit that Claims 18-23, 25-33, 49, 57-58, 64, 69, and 74 are not anticipated by Zelinka and respectfully request that this rejection be removed.

III. Claims 46 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Zelinka. All of these claims are cancelled without prejudice by the present amendment, rendering this rejection moot.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants have addressed all grounds for rejection and Applicants' claims as amended should be passed to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, or if a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the present application, Applicant encourages the Examiner to call the undersigned collect at 608-218-6900.

Dated: August 12, 2005



Mary Ann D. Brown
Registration No. 42,363

MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP
101 Howard Street, Suite 350
San Francisco, California 94105
(608) 218-6900